REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-22, 25, 27-29, 31, 33-42, 44 and 45 were presented for examination. In an Office action dated January 22, 2008, claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-22, 25, 27-29, 31, 33-42 and 44-45 were rejected. Claim 31 is amended herein to more distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and objections and withdraw them.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 31 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention and thus request withdrawal of this rejection as drawn to the amended claims.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-22, 25, 27, 31, 33-42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Klemmer et al. ("Books with Voices: Paper Transcripts as a Tangible Interface to Oral Histories", CHI 2003, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, Apr. 5-10, 2003, pp. 89-96") in view of Graham et al. (US Pat. 6,369,811) . Applicant traverses this ground of rejection.

Applicants believe that Klemmer is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) recites: "a person shall be entitled to a patent unless… the invention was patented or <u>described in a printed publication</u> in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, <u>more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent</u> in the United States."

The earliest priority date for the present application is September 24, 2003 (the date the Provisional Applications to which this application claims priority were filed). Klemmer was published Apr. 5-10, 2003, which is <u>less than one year</u> prior to the date of the application for patent. Therefore, Klemmer is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and cannot be used for a ground for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants therefore respectfully request that Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Furthermore, even if Klemmer was prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the combination of Klemmer and Graham would fail to teach the limitations of the claimed invention.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A computer system for generating a representation of time-based media, the system comprising:
    a feature extraction module for:
    extracting features from media content; and
    generating a media representation representing the features extracted;
    a formatting module for formatting the media representation generated, the formatting module being communicatively coupled to the feature extraction module to apply features extracted to the media representation, wherein the formatting module formats the media representation according to a representation specification; and
    a printer for printing the formatted media representation, the printer being communicatively coupled to the formatting module to receive instructions for printing a document displaying the formatted media representation, *wherein the formatted media representation includes a <u>graphical representation a of timeline</u>* and a plurality of user selectable identifiers representing the features extracted from the media content for selection by a user to play media content segments of a defined length associated with each of the features, *wherein the plurality of selectable identifiers are <u>linked to locations</u> on the timeline.*

Claim 25 discloses the following:

A method for generating a representation of time-based media, the method comprising:

extracting features from media content;

generating a media representation representing the features extracted;

formatting the media representation according to a representation specification, the formatting including applying the features extracted to the media representation; and

printing a document displaying the formatted media representation, *wherein the formatted media representation includes <u>a graphical representation of a timeline</u>* and a plurality of user selectable identifiers representing the features extracted from the media content for selection by a user to play media content segments of a defined length associated with each of the features, *wherein the plurality of selectable identifiers are <u>linked to locations</u> on the timeline.*

Klemmer fails to disclose at least the limitation of "printing a document displaying the formatted media representation, *wherein the formatted media representation includes <u>a graphical representation of a timeline</u>* and a plurality of user selectable identifiers representing the features extracted from the media content for selection by a user to play media content segments of a defined length associated with each of the features, *wherein the plurality of selectable identifiers are <u>linked to locations</u> on the timeline.*"

As claimed, the media representation is printed and displayed, as a <u>graphical representation of a timeline</u>. Merriam Webster's Online Dictionary defines "graphical" as "of or relating to the pictorial art" and "of, relating to, or represented by a <u>graph</u>." *See* Merriam Webster at http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/graphical (emphasis added). Klemmer, however, merely discloses barcodes presented next to sections of a book, which are displayed as text. *See* Klemmer, page 92, Fig. 3. Textual representations are not the same as graphical representations. Therefore, Klemmer fails to disclose or teach "printing a document displaying the formatted media representation, *wherein the formatted media representation includes <u>a graphical representation of a timeline</u>.*"

Further, the media representation includes a plurality of user selectable identifiers (such as machine readable code, text, or an equivalent identifier) that represent the features extracted

from the media content. These identifiers are selectable by a user to play media content segments of a defined length associated with each of the features and each identifier is <u>linked to a location</u> on the timeline. In other words, a graphical representation, such as a single audio waveform timeline is printed. Along with the graphical representation of the timeline, a plurality of selectable identifiers are also displayed, each selectable identifier is associated with a different point along the timeline. As stated above, Klemmer, however, merely discloses barcodes presented next to sections of a book, which are displayed as text. *See* Klemmer, page 92, Fig. 3. The bar codes in Klemmer are merely presented next to the sections of the book. There is no link to any specific location of the book. Therefore, Klemmer fails to disclose or teach "a plurality of user selectable identifiers representing the features extracted from the media content for selection by a user to play media content segments of a defined length associated with each of the features, *wherein the plurality of selectable identifiers are <u>linked to locations</u> on the timeline*."

Graham does not remedy the deficiencies of Klemmer. Graham also does not disclose at least the limitation of "printing a document displaying the formatted media representation, *wherein the formatted media representation includes <u>a graphical representation of a timeline</u>* and a plurality of user selectable identifiers representing the features extracted from the media content for selection by a user to play media content segments of a defined length associated with each of the features, *wherein the plurality of selectable identifiers are <u>linked to locations</u> on the timeline*." Graham merely discloses printing an electronic document with thumbnail images. *See* Graham, col. 5, lines 32-50.

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Furthermore, claims 6, 8, 10, 12-22, 27-29, 31, 33-42, 44, and 45 depend either directly or indirectly from the patentable independent claims 1 or 25 discussed above, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims 1 and 25 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims as well. In addition, claims 6, 8, 10, 12-22, 27-29, 31, 33-42, 44, and 45 recite other patentable features which further distinguish them from the prior art of record. Applicants submit that dependent claims 6, 8, 10, 12-22, 27-29, 31, 33-42, 44, and 45 are patentable over the prior art of record, both alone or in combination, by reason of their dependency, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Withdrawal of the pending rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (650) 335-7805.

Respectfully submitted,
Jonathan J. Hull et al.

Dated: April 22, 2008   By: /Kanda Ishihara/
                                              Kanda Ishihara, Esq.
                                              Reg. No.: 56,607
                                              Fenwick & West LLP
                                              Silicon Valley Center
                                              801 California Street
                                              Mountain View, CA 94041
                                              Tel.: (650) 335-7805
                                              Fax.: (650) 938-5200